



**MINUTES
SCOTTSDALE PLANNING COMMISSION
KIVA – CITY HALL
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
APRIL 13, 2005**

PRESENT: David Gulino, Chairman
Steve Steinberg, Vice Chairman
David Barnett, Commissioner
James Heitel, Commissioner
Eric Hess, Commissioner
Steven Steinke, Commissioner

ABSENT: Jeffrey Schwartz, Commissioner

STAFF: Debbie Abele
Donna Bronski
Mac Cummins
Kurt Jones
Don Meserve
Deborah Robberson
Bill Verschuren
Al Ward
Greg Williams

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Scottsdale Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Gulino at 5:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

A formal roll call confirmed members present as stated above.

APPROVED

MINUTES APPROVAL

March 9, 2005

COMMISSIONER HEITEL MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE MARCH 9, 2005 MINUTES AS PRESENTED. SECOND BY COMMISSIONER HESS.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

CONTINUANCES

5-TA-2004 (Overall Text Amendment (Definitions)) request by City of Scottsdale, applicant, for a Text Amendment of the Zoning Ordinance to amend Article I. Administration & Procedures, Article III. Definitions, Article IV. Districts and Boundaries, Article V. District Regulations, Article VI. Supplementary Districts, Article VII. General Provisions, Article VIII. Sign Requirements, Article IX. Parking and Loading Requirements and Article X. Landscaping Requirements in order to update the Zoning Ordinance.

COMMISSIONER HEITEL MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE CASE 5-TA-2004 TO A DATE TO BE DETERMINED. WITH THE RECOMMENDATION THOSE DEFINITIONS COME EVERY TIME WE HAVE A TEXT AMENDMENT SO THAT WE HAVE DEFINITIONS NOT AT ONE TIME BUT WE HAVE DEFINITIONS AT EVERY INTERVAL BECAUSE IT IS HARD TO MAKE DEFINITIONS ON SOMETHING YOU HAVE NOT DEFINED. SECOND BY COMMISSIONER HESS.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

INITIATION

General Plan Criteria (2-GP-2005) request to initiate a General Plan Amendment to amend the General Plan criteria.

MR. JONES stated this is a request to initiate a General Plan amendment to consider amending the Major General Plan amendment criteria. He presented this request as per the project coordination packet. Recently, there was an item placed on the City Council agenda for next week, to reconsider the motion to review potential modifications to the criteria that determine what constitutes a Major General Plan Amendment within the City of Scottsdale. Staff reported the Commission has three options:

- 1) Initiate
- 2) Continue this item for two weeks and wait to hear what the re-consideration topics are at the City Council next week.

APPROVED

3) Not Initiate

CHAIRMAN GULINO stated he has received five citizen comment cards from people that would like to speak. He further stated that he thought it would make sense for these citizens to make their concerns known to the City Council on Tuesday, but if they wish to speak, they would have the opportunity.

COMMISSIONER HEITEL stated that it would make sense to continue and defer to the Council and let them determine the direction.

CHAIRMAN GULINO inquired if continuing this request to the Commission's next meeting would impact making the 2005 schedule. Mr. Jones replied in the negative. Chairman Gulino remarked that it makes sense to continue this request.

COMMISSIONER STEINKE MOVED TO CONTINUE 2-GP-2005 TO THE APRIL 27, 2005 PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING. SECOND BY COMMISSIONER HEITEL.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

EXPEDITED AGENDA

23-AB-2004 (Groman Residence) request by owners to abandon a 10-foot strip of 76th Street right-of-way on the west side adjacent to parcels 216-69-003R, 216-69-003Q, and 216-69-003S.

(PULLED TO REGULAR AGENDA)

36-UP-2004 (Comerica Bank) request for a conditional use permit for a bank on a 50,000 +/- square feet parcel located at 14801 N. Scottsdale Road with Industrial Park (I-1) zoning.

65-ZN-1992#5 (Scottsdale Riverwalk Square) request by owner for site plan approval as stipulated in Case 65-ZN-1992#4 on an acre portion of the parcel located northeast of Camelback Road on Scottsdale Road with Downtown Regional Commercial Office, Type 2. Planned Block Development Downtown Overlay (D/RCO-2 PBD DO) zoning.

52-ZN-1997#3 (X Lofts) request by owner to rezone from Highway Commercial District, Downtown Overlay (C-3 DO) to Downtown/Office Commercial Type 2 District, Planned Block Development, Downtown Overlay (D/OC-2 PBD DO) on a 1.43 +/- acre parcel located at 7044, 7050 and 7106 E. Osborn Road and to add the Planned Block Development (PBD) and amend the site plan/stipulations

from case 52-ZN-1997#2 on a 1.28 +/- acre parcel located at 7116 and 7126 E. Osborn Road.

MR. JONES stated there is a modified stipulation on case 52-ZN-1997#3 with regard to the Development Review Board looking at a 10 foot wide, minimum 5 foot wide public access easement across the site.

COMMISSIONER HEITEL MOVED TO FORWARD CASE 36-UP-2004 TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL SUBJECT THAT IT MEETS THE USE PERMIT CRITERIA. MOVED TO FORWARD CASES 65-ZN-1992#5 AND 52-ZN-1997#3 WITH THE MODIFIED STIPULATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL. SECOND BY COMMISSIONER HESS.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0).

REGULAR AGENDA

23-AB-2004 (Groman Residence) request by owners to abandon a 10-foot strip of 76th Street right-of-way on the west side adjacent to parcels 216-69-003R, 216-69-003Q, and 216-69-003S.

(COMMISSIONER BARNETT DECLARED A CONFLICT AND DID NOT PARTICIPATE IN THE DISCUSSION OR THE VOTE.)

MR. WILLIAMS responded to the question in the study session regarding the Foothills Overlay, noting when the ESL was revised, it did not affect the Foothills Overlay. He reviewed the dimensions of the local street, which includes a trail.

COMMISSIONER HEITEL stated he would like to respect the ongoing dialogue that the citizens are having up there and not precipitously abandon these until we have definitive direction from Council. Mr. Jones stated the direction from Council with regard to GLO easements is to continue to look at them individually. He further stated that it would be great if we could deal with these in a broader basis rather than an individual basis.

COMMISSIONER HEITEL MOVED TO FORWARD CASE 23-AB-2004 TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMEND FOR DENIAL. SECOND BY COMMISSIONER HESS.

COMMISSIONER HESS stated he shares Commissioner Heitel's concerns and felt the Commission has not been given the appropriate direction from the Council.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF THREE (3) TO TWO (2) WITH CHAIRMAN GULINO AND COMMISSIONER STEINKE DISSENTING, AND COMMISSIONER BARNETT ABSTAINING.

24-ZN-2004 & 9-HP-2004 (Town and Country Scottsdale HP Overlay) request by City of Scottsdale, applicant, to rezone from Single Family Residential District (R-1-7) and Medium-Density Residential District, restricted (R-3) to Single Family Residential District, Historic Property (R1-7 HP) and Medium-Density Residential District, restricted, Historic Property (R-3 HP) with an HP overlay, and designated the Town and Country Scottsdale subdivision, located between Oak Street and Monte Vista, 72nd and 74th Streets (62 lots approximately 12 acres) as a historic district and place this neighborhood on the Scottsdale Historic Register.

MR. JONES stated during the study session the question was asked if the designation of the HP property change the General Plan character element and necessitate a major General Plan amendment to change the character area and then apply the Historic Property overlay.

COMMISSIONER BARNETT inquired if historic designation is a way to define a character area of a space. He discussed the reasons why he felt HP designation should require a General Plan amendment.

COMMISSIONER BARNETT inquired that under the major general plan amendment criteria there are specific criteria. The 1st criteria is: change land use category; not something were talking about with HP designation. The 2nd criteria is area of change criteria in the southern part of the city designated in zone A and B of Major Plan being 10 acres or more; does not qualify in this area either. The 3rd criteria is acreage criteria overriding incentives; I don't think this is a criteria, as well. The 4th criteria which is sub-category #3 in Major plan amendment is character area criteria. Do you think Historic Designation is a way to find a character area of a space? Which Mr. Jones responded in the affirmative. Secondly, another character area is age of development, which is primary goal of what I think HP is, classifying a character area primarily based on age of development. If that's the case, character area criteria it's not a defined character area criteria under section 3, but HP seems to be an embodiment of character area. If that the case why aren't we following the major plan amendment, subsection 3 and having to go thru the major plan amendment as well as the HP Process?

Mr. Grant presented information regarding why a General Plan amendment would not be necessary.

Mr. Grant responded that there was a similar case that came forward last year, Cattletrack. Where designation on character type map of GP changing from Rural to Suburban, in that instance the change constituted enough of a difference

in the character of the area because of the density that the area was going to experience with the rezoning that was requested in parallel that it was processed as a major amendment. Another similar instance was where Sherwood Heights came forward with a PCD overlay to restrict height and that wasn't processed as a GP amendment. So I think you can look at character in various parts of the general plan. What we have applied historically is if it's a change that's reflected on that map from one category to another then it doesn't need to meet the criteria of the others. The area criteria that jump in category and so forth. In this instance I think HP is not a change in character and I think it can be argued that HP would serve to preserve existing character more than market forces or evolution would over time. I don't think this is a case that needs to be processed as a GP amendment.

COMMISSIONER BARNETT I guess I disagree with your interpretation, when I'm reading this I'm looking at character area criteria. We have the four designations: Foothills, Dynamite Foothills, Cactus Corridor and Downtown, none of which are zoning character areas, none of which put significant restrictions on homeowners, none of which are overlays, none of which have any economic negative or positive benefits to a large group of homeowners. At the same time section 2A which we don't fall underneath HP clearly address; 10 acres or more for the southern part of the city and one of our requirements tonight is 12 acres and the other one is 72 acres; 72 acres is significantly bigger than either one of the examples you used.

Commissioner Barnett stated he felt the character area criteria is not a zoning criteria and the HP designation is much stronger and more restrictive than the character area and thus should go through the major plan amendment.

Mr. Grant: I agree with you to the extent that the HP does represents strengthening of the requirements that would be placed or that a neighborhood would place on itself. But I think the distinction is that this underlying zoning is remaining unchanged and the allowable density is remaining unchanged. The experience we've had just with market forces, where somebody would go into a established neighborhood, teardown a structure and build a much larger structure that could be allowed under the existing zoning, really tends to change the character of the area more than applying additional restriction on what people can do to their structures. So I respectfully disagree with the conclusion.

Ms. Robberson presented information regarding why the HP designation would not require a General Plan amendment. Commissioner Barnett stated that he would disagree with staff interpretation of not using a major General Plan amendment specifically for the size of the locations we are talking about tonight.

COMMISSIONER HEITEL expressed his concern about the restrictions the HP overlay would have on homeowners. This clearly is a change in land use in this

area. He stated we might need to clarify issues in either the definition of General Plan or exempt HP overlays in the General Plan so we are consistent.

MS. BRONSKI suggested that the comments of the commissioners' go to the nature of the HP zoning overlay and since there is not a General Plan notice for today the Commission can give their comments to have the Council look at the General Plan issue.

MS. ABELE, Historic Preservation Officer, explained the criteria for HP designation that is set forth in the Scottsdale Ordinance. She reported this process is the result of over three years of work studying this population.

Ms. Abele presented this request as per the project coordination packet. The Historic Preservation Officer and Staff recommend approval.

VICE CHAIRMAN STEINBERG inquired if this were approved tonight what types of changes would be regulated. Ms. Abele replied only changes that would require a building permit.

COMMISSIONER STEINKE inquired if the neighbors were presented information about the protections and benefits of the HP designation. Ms. Abele replied in the affirmative. She reviewed the protections and benefits that will be provided.

CHAIRMAN GULINO inquired if overlay requires the same public participation plan that a zoning case does. Mr. Grant replied if it is a rezoning it goes through the same process. Ms. Abele stated included in the packet is a list that summarizes all of the meetings that were held.

COMMISSIONER HEITEL expressed his concern regarding the extra layer that is added to the process for making changes to these properties. He inquired if the one-year hold up would apply to partial demolitions. Ms. Abele replied the only way to hold up an applicant for one year would be if they intended to demolish the entire building. She responded to questions regarding the process and discussed the technical and financial assistance that is available.

COMMISSIONER BARNETT stated that the code calls for fines of up to \$1,000 per day on homeowners who violate Scottsdale's Historic Ordinance and there are criminal penalties for noncompliance. He inquired if the negative side has been discussed with the neighbors. He further stated that it seems like the penalties are pretty stiff for noncompliance. Ms. Abele replied that it was her understanding those penalties are for violations general zoning code and are not specific to the HP designation.

Commissioner Barnett inquired about the negative feedback staff received from people who do not want the HP designation. Ms. Abele replied most of the feedback has been positive.

COMMISSIONER HEITEL inquired why this process does not require polling the neighbors as to whether they want this designation.

COMMISSIONER HEITEL asked why don't we in these processes on land use restrictions – why don't we have petitions? If we had someone from the development community not do this than they would be thrown out of this Kiva. Why don't we do it – are we afraid of the results? Why aren't we asking neighbors if they want it or don't want it or do we care that we are imposing these restrictions? Why don't we do it?

Ms. Abele explained the process is based on meeting the adopted ordinance criteria.

Ms Abele: I think the reason that we don't do this has to do with the 1976 Supreme Court case and then also in the early 90's an Arizona Supreme Court case related to overlay zoning. Historic Preservation has been upheld by the Supreme Court to be legally justifiable, just exactly because of the fact, that it's based upon criteria that are established in advance, buildings and areas are designated because they meet the criteria not because somebody wants it or doesn't want it, it is an objective method by which a community decides those resources that are important to use the police power to protect and in reviewing this case and the process that was used, and in this case it was New York City, the criteria and the process designation when the Supreme Court upheld this, this sent a message to the rest of the communities that this is what we've got to look at so that it is legally defensible. This came to Arizona when there was a case in the City of Phoenix about the transient and inebriant zones and there ability to overlay those and other areas and a number of overlay zones were struck down as being illegal by the Arizona Supreme Court but not the historic district overlays because they used objective criteria and it's not one neighborhood wants it and one neighborhood doesn't and that's the basis of the decision so we do it so that we are legally justified.

(CHAIRMAN GULINO OPENED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

DOUG SYDNOR, 7468 N. Willowrain Court, representing American Institute of Architects, stated he was a past founding member of the Historic Preservation Commission. He spoke in support of the HP designation. He reported Town and Country represents the best of the best for this building type left in Scottsdale. He presented information on the rigorous process the HP program has gone through to reach this point. He commented on the numerous open houses and neighborhood meetings that have been held. He strongly urged support of the HP designation.

JOANN HANDLEY, 6813 E. Monterey Way, spoke in support of this request. She stated this subdivision represents what Scottsdale was like 50 years ago. She urged the Commission to support the HP overlay for this subdivision.

EDWARD WIMMER, 6702 N. 80th Place, representing the Historic Preservation Commission, spoke in support of this request. He stated he is the Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission. He presented information on the process for designating this subdivision. He commented on the importance of preserving this subdivision.

(CHAIRMAN GULINO CLOSED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

COMMISSIONER STEINKE MOVED TO FORWARD CASE 24-ZN-2004 & 9-HP-2004 TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL.

(THE MOTION FAILED DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.)

COMMISSIONER HEITEL stated that he has always been supportive of citizens coming to this city asking for character areas, zoning overlays, and historic designations when it has come from the people. He further stated that he was not comfortable with the tone and the process and felt there are still some open-ended questions that were discussed earlier about the General Plan process. The General Plan process goes to the heart of trying to get citizen involvement.

COMMISSIONER HEITEL MOVED TO CONTINUE CASES 24-ZN-2004 & 9-HP-2004 AND BROUGHT BACK WHEN WE HAVE A POLLING OF ALL THE CITIZENS IN SOME KIND OF PETITION FORM. AND A DEFINITIVE ANSWER ON THE GENERAL PLAN QUESTION BECAUSE THERE IS A DIFFERENCE OF OPINION THAT HAS NOT BEEN FULLY DISCUSSED. SECOND BY VICE CHAIRMAN STEINBERG.

CHAIRMAN GULINO stated in general he is not a big fan of the historic overlay because of the extra layer of regulation that can sometimes cause problems. He further stated that he would agree this is a worthwhile historic area that should be preserved in some fashion. He remarked that the questions regarding the General Plan are worthy of discussion. He further remarked that he would support the continuance of the case but not at our level because of the timing those issues should be dealt with by the City Council.

MS. BRONSKI reminded the Commission that you need to vote based on the ordinance as it is written today. And the ordinance as written today sets up this process so she would not want anyone to vote to continue this to suggest a process that is not required by the code because that would not be appropriate

and would be adding requirements to the process. This process was adopted by the City Council and we need to follow it.

CHAIRMAN GULINO stated the maker of the motion was requesting additional information in our packets that relates to public involvement. Mr. Bronski stated she would agree if the Commission has not received sufficient information that would be reason to continue, however, the motion is asking for polling of the neighbors, which is not part of the process set forth under the current zoning ordinance. Chairman Gulino stated his interpretation is that we are looking for the public involvement report and he did not see it in the packet. Mr. Meserve reported the public involvement report is Attachment 9.

MS. BRONSKI recommended an amendment to the motion because she thought it was not in order.

COMMISSIONER HEITEL inquired if the HP Ordinance specifically prohibits his request for additional information. Ms. Bronski replied the HP Ordinance does not specifically prohibit a request for additional information but polling each of the individual houses is not set forth in the code. Commissioner Heitel inquired if the HP Overlay Zoning Ordinance specifically prohibits a polling in its broadest sense. Contact with individual property owners is that specifically prohibited. Ms. Bronski replied no it is not specifically prohibited, however, that is not the process set forth in the code. Therefore, the staff cannot be directed to do that. She stated the Commission could recommend it to Council and Council could require them to do polling of the neighbors. Commissioner Heitel stated if staff is saying my motion is illegal he would amend his motion.

COMMISSIONER HEITEL AMENDED THE MOTION AND MOVED TO FORWARD CASES 24-ZN-2004 & 9-HP-2004, 25-ZN-2004 & 10-HP-2004 TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR DENIAL. SECOND BY COMMISSIONER BARNETT.

COMMISSIONER HEITEL stated for the record that he withdrew the first motion on the advise of the City Attorney that his motion was illegal and withdrew it only for that purpose and replaced it with the one he just indicated. Ms. Bronski stated they have to deal with each case separately because they have not had the public hearing on the second case yet.

CHAIRMAN GULINO stated the motion for cases 24-ZN-2004 & 9-HP-2004 was withdrawn and a new motion is put in place for a recommendation for denial. Commissioner Heitel replied that is correct. Commissioner Barnett stated that he concurred.

CHAIRMAN GULINO called for the vote on the motion for denial of cases 24-ZN-2004 & 9-HP-2004.

**THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF FOUR (4) TO TWO (2) WITH
CHAIRMAN GULINO AND COMMISSIONER STEINKE DISSENTING.**

25-ZN-2004 & 10-HP-2004 (Village Grove 1-6 HP Overlay) request by City of Scottsdale, applicant, to rezone from Single Family Residential District (R-1-7) to Single Family Residential District, Historic Property (R1-7 HP) with an HP overlay, and designate Village Grove 1-6 subdivision located between Oak Street to Almeria Road, and between 66th Place and 69th Street (255 lots approximately 72 acres) as a historic district and to place this neighborhood on the Scottsdale Historic Register.

MS. ABELE presented this request as per the project coordination packet. The Historic Preservation Officer and Staff recommend approval.

COMMISSIONER STEINKE stated that his experience over many years in working with historic preservation has been that the positives have always outweighed the negatives. He further stated that he has seen individual isolated cases where they are challenged and it is a bit difficult to deal with but the overall benefit has in his experience always been positive. He commented he would like to see these particular items passed and move on. He further commented that he felt his colleagues' questions and concerns are genuine. He concluded he supports historic preservation as being a positive thing for a community.

(CHAIRMAN GULINO OPENED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

TIM REILING, 6841 E. Almeria Rd, spoke in opposition to this request. He stated he has been to numerous meetings, they have been compared to Willow District, and they are completely different. He further stated their neighborhood is not deteriorating and nobody is looking to tear them down. People are investing money and keeping the same look without the need for the city to get involved. He noted that stucco is not part of the original materials and would not be approved. He further noted that some of the houses have been changed to stucco since the map was made and would not be considered significant. He added he has even heard there would be landscape restrictions.

COMMISSIONER BARNETT stated Mr. Reiling's comments are regarding property rights. He inquired if other neighbors are as dissatisfied with this process as Mr. Reiling is. Mr. Reiling replied in the affirmative. Also, some people are misinformed.

GARY FRERE, 6708 N. Palm Lane, spoke in support if this request. He stated he has been a resident of south Scottsdale for 41 years. He further stated he bought in his neighborhood because he was not a fan of stucco. He reported south Scottsdale has become the unwanted stepchild and the only time we felt the City of Scottsdale recognized them is when the preservation efforts started.

JOY RICH, 6643 E. Monte Vista Rd, spoke in support of this request. She stated that we specifically chose this area for a specific reason because of the neighborhood. She further stated we believe this neighborhood is significant and has a high degree of integrity. She reported there is a Historic Preservation Ordinance that has been adopted by the City Council. There are specific criteria in the ordinance that the Commission is mandated to assess this proposal in accordance with.

JOANN HANDLEY, 6813 E. Monterey Way, spoke in support of this request. She further stated that so much of the community has been lost. This neighborhood has a character of its own. She urged the Commission to support the HP overlay for this subdivision.

DOUG SYDNOR, 7468 N. Willowrain Court, representing American Institute of Architects, stated he supports this request. He further stated it is the Planning Commission's charge to enforce the current zoning ordinance language as adopted by the City Council and as interpreted by the City Attorney and Planning Director this evening. He commented that he thought each of the commissioners' should thoroughly read their packets and come prepared before judging such important matters before casting votes.

MIKE HANRAHAN, 6631 N. Palm Lane, spoke in support of this request. He stated he strongly supports the idea of this historic preservation overlay. He further stated now we are seeing significant construction that is undermining the architectural character and historic character of the neighborhood.

EDWARD WIMMER, 6702 N. 80th Place, representing the Historic Preservation Commission, spoke in support of this request. He stated there was a comment that some of the homes no longer conform that in the time since we did the survey a year ago many of the properties have already been altered and so there is a time issue involved. He requested the Commission deliberate the case based on the merits of the case and the city ordinance.

(CHAIRMAN GULINO CLOSED PUBLIC TESTIMONY.)

MS. ABELE reported since the time we initiated the process there have been changes made in the neighborhood so we will update the map before we go to Council. The percentage has decreased because of changes made to buildings from 92% to 90%.

COMMISSIONER STEINKE MOVED TO FORWARD CASES 25-ZN-2004 & 10-HP-2004 TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL.

(THE MOTION FAILS DUE TO LACK OF A SECOND.)

COMMISSIONER HEITEL reiterated that generally he supports historic preservation efforts. He stated he is a third generation Arizonian and he remembers many of those families who moved into this community after World War II who fought against the arbitrary imposition of police powers. This process requires information and the City Attorney have told me that it is illegal to ask for additional information about people that live in the subdivision. Information the he would like to have so he could move forward with a determination of what is before us but that is illegal. So, I am left with no other alternative but to recommend denial.

COMMISSIONER HEITEL MOVED TO FORWARD CASES 25-ZN-2004 & 10-HP-2004 TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR DENIAL. SECOND BY COMMISSIONER BARNETT.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A VOTE OF FOUR (4) TO TWO (0) WITH CHAIRMAN GULINO AND COMMISSIONER STEINKE DISSENTING.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the regular meeting of the Scottsdale Planning Commission was adjourned at approximately 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

"For the Record " Court Reporters